
HOW ARE WE STUDYING MIGRANT WELL-BEING? A CRITICAL VIEW FROM A LIBERATING COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY APPROACH

Virginia Paloma^{*}, Manuel García-Ramírez^{*}, Carlos Camacho^{**}
and Lucas Olmedo^{*}

The improvement of migrant population well-being is both a goal in itself as well as a necessary component for achieving a cohesive multicultural society. To contribute to this challenge, this work (a) reviews how migrant well-being has been studied by mainstream psychology; (b) assesses its development from a critical view; and (c) proposes theoretical and methodological approaches to analyze this phenomenon from a more comprehensive perspective. Thus, we emphasize the need for developing analyses which explore the impact of oppressive contextual factors on migrants' well-being. These analyses must go beyond individual and culturalist perspectives and consider migrants as active agents who struggle and transform the context along their acculturation process. Furthermore, these analyses have to produce specific proposals to improve migrants' well-being. In order to achieve the former, a liberating community psychology approach together with the use of innovative methodologies of analysis (i.e. multilevel analysis and system dynamics) is proposed as the appropriate framework and tools for overcoming the mentioned challenges.

Keywords: acculturation, liberation, migrant, social justice, well-being

1. Introduction

People who migrate usually aim to improve their living conditions, hence, their own well-being. However, these expectations are not always achieved, especially in receiving contexts that are more oppressive toward migrants (García-Ramírez, De la Mata, Paloma, & Hernández-Plaza, 2011).

This is the case of Andalusia, the most southern region of Spain, whose growth model (currently under revision) demanded a high volume of migrant workers during the first years of the XXI century. This population has suffered multiple risks of social vulnerability. Most

^{*} Department of Social Psychology, University of Sevilla, Spain ✉

^{**} Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Sevilla, Spain

migrants living in Andalusia are placed in disenfranchised neighborhoods or in segregated rural areas with no access to basic resources such as electricity or water; with community services scarcely adapted to their needs (Hernández-Plaza, García-Ramírez, Camacho, & Paloma, 2010). In addition, the migrant population living in Andalusia have built their social networks mostly on compatriots or ethnically similar people, having little presence members from host communities as sources of social support (Martínez, García-Ramírez, & Maya Jariego, 2001). In the same regard, but also reinforced by the actual economic crisis, 64% of Andalusians have a negative opinion toward migration (OPAM, 2013). Like in some other countries, the vision of migrants as competitors is gaining strength, fuelling a tendency toward the social fragmentation of host contexts (García-Ramírez et al., 2011). The hard conditions that migrant workers have suffered are just one of the expressions of inequality that emerge from a social model built on the scarcity of social justice values.

As a consequence, we have the challenge to develop theoretical frameworks and to implement social policies that can improve the well-being of migrants groups. We assume that it is a goal in itself as well as a necessary component for achieving a cohesive multicultural society. Likewise, we can state that the well-being of cultural minorities represents a valuable indicator of the social justice within a society (Fonseca & Malheiros, 2005). In order to move forward in this direction, this work (a) reviews how migrant well-being has been studied by mainstream psychology; (b) assesses its development from a critical view; and (c) proposes a liberating community psychology approach and the use of innovative technologies in order to analyze this phenomenon from a more comprehensive perspective.

2. The Study of Well-being from the Psychology of Acculturation

The concept of well-being was developed around the XIX century, after the social instability provoked by the industrial revolution (Blanco & Valera, 2007). From the psychological field, many studies have understood the term well-being as the positive evaluation that a person makes about her own life, thus, her life satisfaction (Diener & Diener, 1996; Myers & Diener, 1995; Veenhoven, 1994). This cognitive dimension constitutes, together with the positive and negative affections, the theoretical concept of subjective well-being.

Trying to explain the well-being of different populations, psychology has mainly studied the following determinants (Diener, 1994; Myers & Diener, 1995): (a) *economic level*, people with more resources normally show higher levels of well-being, although once the basic needs are covered this value remains stable; (b) *employment*, those who feel that they do a meaningful work show better well-being than those unemployed; (c) *religion*, participating in religious events is positively related to well-being; (d) *marital status*, married people show higher levels of well-being than others; (e) *social contacts*, satisfaction with love issues and having friends to share private issues is connected with life satisfaction; (f) *physical health*, is positively related to well-being; and (g) *personality*, people who are extrovert, optimistic, with high self-esteem and personal control show higher levels of well-being.

The focus on these dimensions—all of them individuals—entails that “external factors often have only a modest impact on well-being reports [...] and that [subjective well-being] is often strongly correlated with stable personality traits” (Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2003, p. 406). Likewise, Vennhoven (1994) supports that most of the differences concerning life satisfaction

are related to socio-emotional factors, although he recognizes that life satisfaction is more similar in countries with similar socio-economic situations, where human rights are respected and where it exists good access to knowledge.

The psychology of acculturation (PA) has been studying the well-being of migrant population. This perspective states that when two or more groups come into contact acculturation process happens, a “dual process of cultural and psychological change” (Berry, 2005, p. 698). Cultural changes refer to transformations in social structures and institutions, as well as in the cultural practices of the groups in contact; while psychological changes refer to modifications in the behavior of the involved people.

PA focuses on those psychological changes; its object of study is the adjustment that a person experiences when he/she changes of cultural environment. Traditionally, the analysis is split into two domains: (1) psychological adjustment, or degree of well-being of a certain person; and (2) socio-cultural adjustment, or degree of competences which allow a person to be integrated into the new cultural environment. According to Ward and Kennedy (1999), the literature related to stress and coping strategies is used as a framework to study psychological adjustment, which is empirically measured with instruments that focus on different symptoms derived from cultural shock (tension, depression, fear, fatigue or confusion). Socio-cultural adjustment uses an interpretative framework and tries to measure the “adjustment” of the individual to a new environment.

This perspective assumes that “despite substantial variations in the life circumstances of the cultural groups that experience acculturation, the psychological processes that operate during acculturation are essentially same for all the groups” (Berry & Sam, 1997, p. 296; cit. in Chirkov, 2009, p. 96). Hence it is supported the existence of universal factors which explain the psychological adjustment and the well-being of migrants. After a literature review of PA looking at these factors, Jibeen and Khalid (2010) consider that sociodemographic variables (e.g., age, gender, education) and variables related to acculturation (e.g. length of stay in the host country, reasons for migrating, similarities between the country of origin and the host country, willingness for migration) determine the levels of migrants’ well-being. More specifically, three approaches developed within the PA are reviewed below.

Firstly, the PA connects the success of migrants’ culturally adjustment to the new context with their well-being; due to the relationship established between socio-cultural and psychological adjustment. LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton (1993) support that “the key to psychological wellbeing may well be the ability to develop and maintain competence in both cultures” (p. 402). Thus having bicultural competences, i.e. having knowledge, positive attitudes, communicative skills and proper behaviors within both cultures, can be considered among the main factors of well-being. For example, migrants who are proficient in the host language have higher salaries (at least 15%), which is related to a higher level of well-being (Chiswick & Miller, 2002).

A second approach within PA focuses, as the main factors of well-being, on the acculturative stress and the coping strategies used by migrants. Migrants often suffer stress when trying to solve or minimize the conflicts that merge when making contact with culturally different groups (Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987). Higher degrees of acculturative stress are connected with lower levels of well-being (Jibeen & Khalid, 2010). In order to overcome this stress, the coping strategies oriented toward tasks and the use of the sense of humor provoke greater psychological adjustment; whereas avoidance strategies are connected with depressive symptoms (Jibeen & Khalid, 2010; Ward & Kennedy, 2001).

Thirdly, according to the bi-dimensional acculturation model (Berry, 2005; Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001), the type of cultural identity developed determines the well-being and psychological adjustment of a person. These authors support that migrant people develop certain types of identity according to: (1) ethnic identity, defined as self-identification, feelings of belonging, shared values and commitment toward their ethnic group; and (2) national identity, which implies feelings of belonging and positive attitudes toward the host population. Combining these criteria emerge four possible acculturative strategies or types of identities: bicultural (high levels of both types of identities), separated (high ethnic identity and low national identity), assimilated (low ethnic identity and high national identity) and marginalized (low levels of both types of identities). The authors find that people who develop a bicultural identity obtain higher levels of psychological adjustment and well-being; besides, those who develop a marginalized identity obtain the worst levels. Assimilation and separation obtain intermediate levels of adjustment.

The former is consistent with the findings of Yoon, Lee, and Goh (2008), who found that (a) the acquisition of the new culture has a positive, direct and meaningful effect on the well-being of migrants; and (b) maintaining one's culture has also a positive effect on well-being (although it presents lower explanatory power, possibly due to the scarce variability of the data on this dimension). Therefore the identification with their own ethnic group is crucial for self-concept and psychological functioning of the members of cultural minorities in a diverse society, determining their happiness (Phinney & Ong, 2007).

In their attempt to understand the motives that push migrants to adopt different acculturation strategies, Zlobina, Basabe, and Páez (2008), state that bicultural individuals "are more oriented [than the separated] to be competent and successful and to have good experiences in their lives" (p.149), the separated are "less oriented toward success [...] and pleasant experiences related to try new things or open to changes" (p.149). The assimilated, "are more oriented toward self-promotion and new experiences" (p. 149). However, Phinney et al. (2001) stated that the type of identity developed not only depends on the personal features or preferences of migrants but also on the public policies, the attitudes of the receiving society, and on the local circumstances (concentration of migrants, neighborhood activities, etc.). They state that "if, however, the host society is accepting of immigrants, newcomers will have the choice of being bicultural" (p. 506), nevertheless "when immigrants are not encouraged or allowed to retain their own culture while integrating into the new society, some are likely to feel forced to choose between the two options of separation and assimilation" (p. 499). In parallel, Berry (2005, 2008) argues that bicultural identity can only be freely chosen by migrant groups when the mainstream society is open and inclusive toward cultural diversity.

In the same regard, Bourhis, Montaruli, El-Geledi, Harvey, and Barrette (2010), try to include the policies implemented in the destination country as a determinant factor that influence the type of identity chosen by migrants but also the type of identity that host communities prefer that migrants choose. According to these authors, higher levels of well-being will be obtained when the gap between the preferences of the two groups is low, and more concretely, when both groups choose bicultural identities as their preferred option. This idea is supported by Roccas, Horenczyk, and Schwartz (2000), whose findings sustain that there is a negative relation between the life satisfaction of migrants and the gap perceived by migrants between their chosen type of identity and the type of identity preferred by the dominant group. The former is especially important for people with a higher degree of conformism, that is, a need of compliance with social norms which affect negatively their personal comforts and well-being. Furthermore, Navas

et al. (2005) state that there is higher risk of conflict between natives and migrants when discrepancies between the core dimensions of the involved cultures appear (i.e., ways of thinking, values, religious beliefs, habits).

Summing up, PA considers the influence of five factors on the well-being of migrants: (a) socio-demographic variables (e.g., age, gender, education), (b) specific variables related to the acculturation process (e.g., length of stay in the host country, reasons for migrating, similarities between the country of origin and the host country, willingness for migration), (c) their competence within the new cultural environment, (d) the development of effective coping strategies to reduce acculturative stress, and (e) the development of bicultural identity—if possible within an environment that promotes this identity option. In the next section we will assess the work developed by the PA from a liberating community psychology approach.

3. A Critical View of Psychology of Acculturation concerning Migrant Well-being

In spite of the general agreement about the key role that contextual factors (public policies, degree of concentration of migrants in a certain area, neighborhood activities, among others) play in the processes of acculturation (Berry, 2005; Rudmin, 2006), few research has been done about how this contextual factors influence on migrants well-being (Herrero, Fuente, & Gracia, 2011; Nation, 2008; Shinn & Toohey, 2003). Hence, it is ignored that “individuals’ place of residence influences their opportunities and life outcomes” (Osypuk, Galea, McArdle, & Acevedo-Garcia, 2009, p. 26); minimizing the context and assigning all the explanatory variance to individual differences (Shinn & Toohey, 2003).

As a result, most studies have entirely focused on the analysis of the individual level (Albee, 1998; Jones, 1994). Although social exclusion has been associated with low levels of well-being, psychology has focused on (a) explaining social issues from individual features (Nation, 2008), and (b) training problem solving skills, assertiveness, stress reduction techniques and coping strategies (Kieffer, 1984). Prilleltensky (2012) argues that the researchers who have studied well-being “rarely if ever invoke justice in their explanations. In most cases, culture, age, marriage, social support, unemployment, and adaptation figure prominently on the list of well-being predictors; justice, however, does not” (p. 2). Thus, there is a tendency to “individualize wellness: the problematic site is the individual who is unwell, not the conditions surrounding her” (p. 18). However, the individual emphasis of acculturation theoretical framework is challenged by the asymmetric intergroup relations together with the political, social and economic power inequalities that many migrants face (García-Ramírez et al., 2009).

Moreover, PA analyzes social groups taken into account their culture, excluding any other dimension (Carpenter-Song, Nordquest, & Longhofer, 2007). This kind of analysis, which considers culture as a synonym of identity and explains intergroup relations exclusively from it, has been called “essentialist” multiculturalism (Oliveri, 2008). From this point of view, social conflicts and inequalities are grounded in cultural factors, thus no political intervention would be needed within the social structure. Although conflicts between migrants and native neighbors arise in some neighborhoods and cities; these conflicts are often a consequence of residential segregation, deprivation of access to social resources, unemployment or social exclusion (MTIN, 2007). This analysis matches with the view of UNESCO (2009) when stated that “it exists a

temptation to consider that cultural factors motivate conflicts when they are just the excuse to trigger them; their main motive are rooted in political and socioeconomic factors” (p. 32).

Bhatia and Ram (2001) criticize the universalist perspective of PA, since it undervalues “the asymmetrical relations of power and the inequalities and injustices faced by certain immigrant groups” (p. 8). Likewise, some studies show how the oppressive conditions of the context can minimize the positive effect of language proficiency on the well-being of migrants (Hernández-Plaza et al., 2010) and that the development of rich cultural identities seem to be reserved for those with enough economic resources (Oliveri, 2008). On the other hand, historic and political factors are rarely brought into the analysis, assuming that both majority and minority groups are in a balanced relation of status and power. The answers of minorities are considered as “preferences” chosen within a free choice scenario, being each person entirely responsible of their “decision” (Rudmin, 2006). Hence, the mainstream acculturation literature has important limitations since it does not consider the role of power and oppression (Sonn & Lewis, 2009). The research that attempts to assess the impact of injustice in the lives of people is scarce (Prilleltensky & Fox, 2007).

The bidimensional acculturation model sustains that the orientation toward origin ethnic culture and toward the receiving culture can be independent and inclusive. Nevertheless, Flannery, Reise, and Yu (2001) found that both dimensions are not independent of each other in real life ($r = -0.55$). This result suggests that oppressive conditions of many receiving contexts (not taken into account in the majority of studies) make incompatible ethnic and national identities, forcing migrants to choose between two options, assimilation or separation. In this sense, Rudmin (2006) states that marginalized identity cannot be considered as a decision taken by the individuals themselves. Furthermore, different authors support that beyond the bicultural identity, acculturation models need to bring in more than two cultures into their explanatory frameworks, as receiving communities are often composed by multiple cultures (Bourhis et al., 2010; Persky & Birman, 2005).

Finally, recent critiques have challenged the applicability of the knowledge produced by mainstream PA in regard to increase the well-being of migrant groups (Hernández-Plaza et al., 2010). On the one hand, bicultural identity - linked to well-being - can only be developed in contexts open to diversity; while on the other hand there are not proposals that lead migrant groups to reach well-being in oppressive or intolerant contexts, which are the vast majority (Paloma, García-Ramírez, De la Mata, & Amal, 2010; Paloma & Manzano-Arrondo, 2011).

4. Proposal of Future Lines from a Liberating Community Psychology Approach

This work assessment implies the need to develop analyses that explore the impact of the conditions of oppressive contexts on the well-being of migrants. These analyses overcome the individual and culturalist levels, moreover, they consider migrant groups as active agents who struggle and transform the context where they live along their acculturation process, but also agents who make useful proposals to improve migrants’ well-being (Albar et al., 2010; García-Ramírez et al., 2011). We suggest the liberating community psychology approach together with the use of innovative methodologies of analysis (i.e. multilevel analysis and system dynamics) as

the adequate framework and tools for overcoming the challenges mentioned above (García-Ramírez et al., 2011; Paloma, García-Ramírez, & Camacho, 2014).

4.1 *A Liberating Community Psychology Approach for the Study of Migrant Well-being*

As defended in previous works (García-Ramírez et al., 2011; Paloma et al., 2014; Paloma, García-Ramírez, & Camacho, 2012), we propose a liberating community psychology approach (LCPA) to integrate community psychology values (i.e., well-being, sense of community, respect for human diversity, social justice, empowerment and citizen participation, collaboration and community strengths, and empirical grounding) and the emphasis of liberation psychology to transform oppressive social contexts that generate human suffering (Martín-Baró, 1986; Moane, 2003). LCPA works to establish (a) a new horizon, with the goal of establishing an effective framework which focuses on the needs of oppressed groups; (b) a new epistemology, where knowledge is built from the bottom and validated in practice; and (c) a new praxis, where scientific work aims to transform the reality and balances power relations between groups (Martín-Baró, 1986). This approach urges the reintroduction of the context because “although psychological reality only acquires concreteness in individuals, its origin is in the social structure” (Martín-Baró, 1983, p. 98). Thus, this approach considers the role of contexts where the migration processes take place, explores the power relations established between receiving and migrant groups, and suggests the transformation of receiving societies as a way to achieve well-being for all collectives (Paloma & Manzano-Arrondo, 2011). It understands that the well-being shown by migrant collectives feeds on the dynamics of interdependence generated between contextual and individual determinants involved in the settlement process (Paloma et al., 2014).

This social justice approach contributes to the understanding of migrant well-being through incorporating (a) the dimension of vulnerability and risk of migrants’ social exclusion, in terms of oppression, and (b) the development of migrant strengths in terms of acquiring a critical thinking toward injustices and generation of practices to protect themselves, resist and overcome oppression according to their values, culture, and needs (García-Ramírez et al., 2011; Sonn & Lewis, 2009).

Furthermore, we assume that migrant well-being is strongly conditioned by the existing social justice of the receiving society (Paloma et al., 2014). Social justice is defined “as the fair and equitable allocation of burden, resources, and power in society” (Prilleltensky, 2008, p. 362). We understand that well-being depends on dimensions placed in different ecological levels: individual (e.g. language proficiency, self-perceived health, coping strategies), relational (e.g. possibility of family reunification, multicultural support networks), organizational (e.g. access to culturally sensitive communitarian services), community (e.g. residential segregation, openness to diversity of the receiving society), and societal (e.g. work, family, education, health, etc. policies). Thus, we agree with Prilleltensky (2008, pp. 359-360) that well-being is a positive state of affair in individuals, relationships, organizations, communities, and the political environment, brought about by the simultaneous and balanced satisfaction of material and psychological needs; and by the manifestation of social justice in these five ecological domains.

4.2 *Innovative Methodologies for the Studying of Migrant Well-being*

The models of data analysis often used within Social Sciences do not capture the systemic, dynamic and multilevel complexity that the study of well-being requires. Different authors express the weakness of a methodological approach based on linear analysis to link variables besides, not being consistent with the complexity of social phenomena studied (Hirsch, Levine, & Miller, 2007). The liberating community psychology approach supported in this work requires tools of analysis where the influence of dimensions placed in different levels of analysis (i.e. individual, relational, organizational, communitarian, and societal) explain the degree of well-being express by migrants. In this work we support the use of multilevel analysis and system dynamics.

Multilevel regression analysis is a tool which “allows us to systematically study the interaction of structural and psychological determinants of complex social phenomena” (Pehrson & Green, 2010, p. 710), and “is an empirical way of understanding the relationship between the structure and the individual” (Hjerm, 2007, p. 1258). This procedure is adequate when we want to analyze the ecological complexity of a phenomenon (Long, 2005) whose variables belong to different levels of analysis. It is not only important the effect of individual factors on well-being, but also the contexts where migrants are embedded (Luke, 2005). In addition, Pettigrew (2006) supports that (a) working at the same time with the individual and contextual level provoke not falling into the compositional fallacy (i.e. elaborate conclusions about the contextual level from an individual analysis) nor in the ecological fallacy (i.e. elaborate conclusions about the individuals from a contextual analysis); and that (b) the use of this approach ensures a close alignment to reality, making easier the transference of results. From a methodological perspective, it is assumed that people who live in the same area share some features, which distinguish them from people who live in other territories. This lack of independency between gathered observations breaks one of the requirements from conventional techniques of analysis, thus in this situations the use of multilevel analysis is needed (Nezlek, 2008).

This kind of tool has produced innovative results in previous works which tried to explain (a) the influence of country features on the well-being of the population on a global level (Inglehart, Foa, Peterson, & Welzel, 2008); (b) the influence of the context in the relation between language proficiency and life satisfaction of migrants in Spain (Hernández-Plaza et al., 2010); and (c) the well-being of migrant population in Finland (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkina, & Perhoniemi, 2007), Canada (Jibeen & Khalid, 2010), Holland (Verkuyten, 2008), and Spain (Paloma et al., 2014). Using this procedure we have tested how the well-being of the Moroccan community in Southern Spain is closely determined by (a) the level of social justice in the receiving context (openness to diversity of receiving communities, cultural sensitivity of community services, and residential integration); and (b) the individual strengths of the migrant population (use of active coping strategies, satisfaction with the receiving context, and residential stability in the new environment). These results empirically support the impact that different ecological levels of analysis have on well-being and highlight the active role that people develop in their relationship with the environment (Paloma et al., 2012, 2014).

System dynamics includes a mathematical tool, which is highly promising in the study of complex social phenomena. This approach requires the inclusion within the model of every element, which can help to explain the object of study, in different levels of analysis. The interdependent relationship among the elements of the model is translated into circular relations, more comprehensive than linear relations, and impossible to solve without simulation

procedures. This methodological approach is an answer to the scientific debate about the need for defining social interventions within systems and not as insulated facts (Hawe, Shiell, & Riley, 2009). In this sense, one of the greater strengths of these models is that they provide us with tools to make virtual experiments that anticipate the behavior of the system under possible interventions in different of its own elements (Homer & Hirsh, 2006). They allow making simulations in order to propose effective interventions to increase the well-being of migrants.

LCPA requires taking into account the psychopolitical validity of our community research (Prilleltensky, 2004). The concept has both an epistemological and a transformative aspect. Epistemological validity would imply taking into account the role of power in every ecological level of analysis related to migrants' well-being. In this case, power means access to material and psychosocial resources, and the opportunity and capacity to achieve well-being (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2002). It requires identifying the main oppressive (or just) contextual factors at different ecological levels, which influences negatively (or positively) the achievement of high levels of well-being among migrant population. For that purpose, it is important to search and give voice to these traditionally silenced groups, thus guarantee that they can contribute to define their own reality. Both multilevel regression analysis and system dynamics can help us to design an explicative and comprehensive framework of migrants' well-being.

Transformative validity refers to the potential of our research activities to reduce power inequalities, increase political activism, and foster participation and commitment among migrants and members of the receiving society (Prilleltensky, 2004). The former obliges us to consider the need of creating interventions to improve migrants' well-being through the promotion of direct changes within the social structure of receiving societies, and through the enhancing of strengths within this oppressed population. Their community engagement as active agents in the social sphere could fuel processes of individual and contextual transformations in order to reach a balanced relation of power among every party involved (Prilleltensky, 2008). System dynamics can help us to simulate which potential public policies and social interventions are the best to provoke the desired changes within a complex network of interrelated factors at different ecological levels and at different temporal spaces. Therefore, epistemological and transformative psychopolitical validity offer, respectively, criteria for a more critical investigation of the status quo and intervention that facilitates social change (Davidson et al., 2006).

This proposal has some limitations. First, we recognize that LCPA is not necessarily applicable to all migratory transitions. It is particularly relevant for those displaced groups entering the receiving context of significantly disadvantaged conditions. Second, we limit our discussion to two innovative quantitative technologies within this text. Although it has not been the focus of this paper, we want to stress the relevance that qualitative methods have in the design of community research, in order to involve and give voice to the migrants in the identification and problem solving which affect them directly (Paloma, Herrera, & García-Ramírez, 2009). Third, although we advocate for the dialogue with other disciplines, we have used in this paper a term that could be not inclusive in the literature, i.e. "liberating community psychology approach". We opt for this terminology because of the focus of this paper in the psychological science and because of the audience of this journal (community psychologists). However, we prefer to use the term "social justice approach" in a multidisciplinary academic context.

The theoretical and methodological approach defended in this paper try to contribute to (a) the consideration of the role of power and oppression in the migrations phenomena (Sonn & Lewis,

2009); and (b) the utility of embedding a multilevel and systemic perspective in the research and action addressed toward migrant populations. For that purpose, it is necessary to bring social transformation to the core of psychological science, and work together with other disciplines and social movements. To avoid falling in a naïve, unreal, and useless psychological discipline, we have to feed our frameworks with both the rich experiences and the fresh inspiration which come from both people and other disciplines. We think that it is the only way to develop scientific initiatives that dignify and produce well-being for migrant populations.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded in part by grants from the Ministry of Science and Innovation of Spanish Government (SEJ2006-14470; PSI2011-25554), and from the Andalusian Public Foundation “Centro de Estudios Andaluces” (PRJ201402367).

References

- Albar, M.J., Camacho, C., García-Ramírez, M., El Jebari, T., El Karkri, M., Hernández-Plaza, S., ... Sevillano, J.M. (2010). Contribuciones de la psicología de la liberación a la integración de la población inmigrante. *Intervención Psicosocial*, 19(3), 223–234.
- Albee, G.W. (1998). Fifty years of clinical psychology: Selling our soul to the devil. *Applied & Preventive Psychology*, 7(3), 189–194.
- Barry R., C., & Miller, P.W. (2005). Do enclaves matter in immigrant adjustment? *City and Community*, 4(1), 5–35.
- Bhatia, S., & Ram, A. (2001). Rethinking “acculturation” in relation to diasporic cultures and postcolonial identities. *Human Development*, 44(1), 1–18.
- Berry, J.W. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29(6), 697–712.
- Berry, J.W. (2008). Globalization and acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32(4), 328–336.
- Berry, J.W. & Sam, D.L. (1997). Acculturation and adaptation. In J.W. Berry, M.H. Segall, and C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 291–326). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Blanco, A., & Valera, S. (2007). Los fundamentos de la intervención psicosocial. En A. Blanco & J. Rodríguez-Marín (Coord.), *Intervención psicosocial* (pp. 5–44). Madrid, Spain: Pearson Educación.
- Bourhis, R.Y., Montaruli, E., El-Geledi, S., Harvey, S.P., & Barrette, G. (2010). Acculturation in multiple host community settings. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(4), 780–802.
- Carpenter-Song, E.A., Nordquest, M., & Longhofer, J. (2007). Cultural competence reexamined: Critique and directions for the future. *Psychiatric Services*, 58(10), 1362–1365.

-
- Chirkov, V.I. (2009). Critical psychology of acculturation: What do we study and how do we study it, when we investigate acculturation? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33(2), 94–105.
- Davidson, H., Evans, S., Ganote, C., Henrickson, J., Jacobs-Priebe, L., Jones, ... Riemer, M. (2006). Power and action in critical theory across disciplines: Implications for critical community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(1/2), 35–49.
- Diener, E. (1994). El bienestar subjetivo. *Intervención Psicosocial*, 3(8), 67–113.
- Diener, E., & Diener, C. (1996). Most people are happy. *Psychological Science*, 7(3), 181–185.
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R.E. (2003). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54(1), 403–425.
- Flannery, W.P., Reise, S.P., & Yu, J. (2001). An empirical comparison of acculturation models. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(8), 1035–1045.
- Fonseca, M.L., & Malheiros, J. (2005). *Social integration and mobility: Education, housing and health*. Lisboa: IMISCOE Network of Excellence on Immigration, Integration and Social Cohesion in Europe.
- García-Ramírez, M., Camacho, C., Hernández-Plaza, S., Albar, M.J., Manzano-Arrondo, V., & Paloma, V. (2009). Psicología de la liberación e integración comunitaria: Identificando las condiciones de opresión en inmigrantes marroquíes del sur de España. In C. Vázquez (Ed.), *Psicología comunitaria internacional: Agendas compartidas en la diversidad* (pp. 212–234). San Juan, Puerto Rico: Universidad de Puerto Rico.
- García-Ramírez, M., De la Mata, M., Paloma, V., & Hernández-Plaza, S. (2011). A liberation psychology approach to acculturative integration of migrant populations. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 47(1/2), 86–97.
- Hawe, P., Shiell, A., & Riley, T. (2009). Theorising interventions as events in systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 43(3/4), 267–276.
- Hernández-Plaza, S., García-Ramírez, M., Camacho, C., & Paloma, V. (2010). New settlement and wellbeing in oppressive contexts: A liberation psychology approach. In S.C. Carr (Ed.), *The psychology of global mobility* (pp. 235–256). New York, NY: Springer.
- Herrero, J., Fuente, A., & Gracia, E. (2011). Covariates of subjective well-being among Latin American immigrants in Spain: The role of social integration in the community. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 39(7), 761–775.
- Hirsch, G., Levine, R., & Miller, R. (2007). Using system dynamics modeling to understand the impact of social change initiatives. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 39(3), 239–253.
- Hjerm, M. (2007). Do numbers really count? Group threat theory revisited. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(8), 1253–1275.
- Homer, J.B., & Hirsh, G.B. (2006). System dynamics modeling for public health: Background and opportunities. *American Journal of Public Health*, 96(3), 452–458.
- Inglehart, R., Foa, R., Peterson, C., & Welzel, C. (2008). Development, freedom, and rising happiness. A global perspective (1981-2007). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(4), 264–285.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K., & Perhoniemi, R. (2007). Perceived ethnic discrimination at work and well-being of immigrants in Finland: The moderating role of employment status and work-specific group-level control beliefs. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 31(2), 223–242.
-

-
- Jibeen, T., & Khalid, R. (2010). Predictors of psychological well-being of Pakistani immigrants in Toronto, Canada. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34(5), 452–464.
- Jones, J.M. (1994). Our similarities are different: Toward a psychology of affirmative diversity. In E.J. Trickett, R.J. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity. Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 27–45). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kieffer, C.H. (1984). Citizen empowerment: A developmental perspective. *Prevention in Human Services*, 3(2/3), 9–36.
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H.L.K., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114(3), 395–412.
- Long, D.A. (2005). *Residential community identification and psychological well-being*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://europepmc.org/theses/ETH/7432>
- Luke, D.A. (2005). Getting the big picture in community science: Methods that capture context. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 35(3/4), 185–200.
- Martín-Baró, I. (1983). *Acción e ideología. Psicología social desde Centroamérica*. San Salvador, El Salvador: UCA Editores.
- Martín-Baró, I. (1986). Hacia una psicología de la liberación. *Boletín de Psicología*, 22, 219–231.
- Martínez, M.F., García-Ramírez, M., & Maya Jariego, I. (2001). Una tipología analítica de las redes de apoyo social de los inmigrantes africanos en Andalucía. *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 95(1), 99–125.
- Mena, F.J., Padilla, A.M., & Maldonado, M. (1987). Acculturative stress and specific coping strategies among immigrant and later generation college students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 9(2), 207–225.
- Moane, G. (2003). Bridging the personal and the political: Practices for a liberation psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 31(1/2), 91–101.
- MTIN (2007). *Plan Estratégico de Ciudadanía e Integración (2007-2010)*. Madrid, Spain: Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración. Retrieved from http://extranjeros.mtin.es/es/IntegracionRetorno/Plan_estrategico/pdf/PECIDEF180407.pdf
- Myers, D.G., & Diener, E. (1995). Who is happy? *Psychological Science*, 6(1), 10–19.
- Nation, M. (2008). Concentrated disadvantage in urban neighborhoods: Psychopolitical validity as a framework for developing psychology-related solutions. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 36(2), 187–198.
- Navas, M., García, M.C., Sánchez, J., Rojas, A.J., Pumares, P., & Fernández, J.S. (2005). Relative acculturation extended model (RAEM): New contributions with regard to the study of acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29(1), 21–37.
- Nelson, G., & Prilleltensky, I. (2002). *Doing psychology critically. Making a difference in diverse settings*. New York, NY: Palgrave Mcmillan.
- Nezlek, J.B. (2008). An introduction to multilevel modeling for social and personality psychology. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(2), 842–860.
- Oliveri, F. (2008). Policies for a fair multicultural society. On the use and abuse of “culture” in relation to migration issues. In Council of Europe, *Reconciling migrants’ well-being and the public interest - Welfare state, firms and citizenship in transition* (pp. 23–55). Belgium: Council of Europe Publishing.
- OPAM (2013). *Informe Anual Andalucía e Inmigración 2012*. Retrieved from <http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/justiciaeinterior/opam/sites/default/files/DOC/Informe%20Anual%202012publication.pdf>
-

-
- Osypuk, T.L., Galea, S., McArdle, N., & Acevedo-Garcia, D. (2009). Quantifying separate and unequal. Racial-ethnic distributions of neighborhood poverty in metropolitan America. *Urban Affairs Review*, 45(1), 25–65.
- Paloma, V., García-Ramírez, M., De la Mata, M., & Amal (2010). Acculturative integration, self and citizenship construction: The experience of Amal-Andaluza, a grassroots organization of Moroccan women in Andalusia. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34(2), 101–113.
- Paloma, V., García-Ramírez, M., & Camacho, C. (2014). Well-being and social justice among Moroccan migrants in southern Spain. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 54(1/2), 1–11.
- Paloma, V., García-Ramírez, M., & Camacho, C. (2012). Relazione tra benessere e giustizia nella popolazione marocchina nel Sud della Spagna. *Psicologia di Comunità*, 1, 81–100.
- Paloma, V., Herrera, I., & García-Ramírez, M. (2009). Psychopolitical validation of health promotion research for migrant populations: Conceptualising well-being among Andalusian Moroccan immigrants. *International Journal of Migration, Health, and Social Care*, 5(1), 25–33.
- Paloma, V., & Manzano-Arrondo, V. (2011). The role of organizations in liberation psychology: Applications to the study of migrations. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 20(3), 309–318.
- Pehrson, S., & Green, E.G.T. (2010). Who we are and who can join us: National identity content and entry criteria for new immigrants. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(4), 695–716.
- Persky, I., & Birman, D. (2005). Ethnic identity in acculturation research. A study of multiple identities of Jewish refugees from the Former Soviet Union. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 36(5), 557–572.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (2006). The advantages of multilevel approaches. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62(3), 615–620.
- Phinney, J.S., Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K., & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic identity, immigration and well-being: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3), 493–510.
- Phinney, J.S., & Ong, A.D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54(3), 271–281.
- Prilleltensky, I. (2004). Validez psicopolítica: El próximo reto para la psicología comunitaria. In M. Montero (Ed.), *Introducción a la Psicología Comunitaria. Desarrollo, conceptos y proceso* (pp. 5–14). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.
- Prilleltensky, I. (2008). Migrant well-being is a multilevel, dynamic, value dependent phenomenon. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 42(3/4), 359–364.
- Prilleltensky, I. (2012). Wellness as fairness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 49(1), 1–21.
- Prilleltensky, I., & Fox, D. (2007). Psychopolitical literacy for wellness and justice. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35(6), 793–805.
- Roccas, S., Horenczyk, G., & Schwartz, S.H. (2000). Acculturation discrepancies and well-being: The moderating role of conformity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30(3), 323–334.
- Rudmin, F.W. (2006). Debate in science: The case of acculturation. *AnthroGlobe Journal*. Retrieved from http://www.anthroglobe.info/docs/rudminf_acculturation_061204.pdf
- Shinn, M., & Toohey, S. (2003). Community contexts of human welfare. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 427–459. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145052.
-

-
- Sonn, C.C., & Lewis, R.C. (2009). Immigration and identity: The ongoing struggles for liberation. In M. Montero & C.C. Sonn (Eds.), *Psychology of liberation: Theory and applications* (pp. 115–134). New York, NY: Springer.
- UNESCO (2009). *Invertir en la diversidad cultural y el diálogo intercultural. Informe mundial de la UNESCO*. París: Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001847/184755S.pdf>
- Veenhoven, R. (1994). El estudio de la satisfacción con la vida. *Intervención Psicosocial*, 3(9), 87–116.
- Verkuyten, M. (2008). Life satisfaction among ethnic minorities: The role of discrimination and group identification. *Social Indicators Research*, 89(3), 391–404.
- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1999). The measurement of sociocultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23(4), 659–677.
- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (2001). Coping with cross-cultural transition. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(5), 636–642.
- Yoon, E., Lee, R.M., & Goh, M. (2008). Acculturation, social connectedness and subjective well-being. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 14(3), 246–255.
- Zlobina, A., Basabe, N., & Páez, D. (2008). Las estrategias de aculturación de los inmigrantes: Su significado psicológico. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 23(2), 143–150.